APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,460	03/14/2001	Mushtaq Bahadur	ILAU-25,644	3538

			EXAMINER
31782	7590	05/19/2004	NGUYEN BA, PAUL H

CHAUZA & HANDLEY, L.L.P.
PO BOX 140036
IRVING, TX 75014

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/808,460	BAHADUR, MUSHTAQ
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Nguyen-Ba	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06/09/03</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 September 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1.   This action is responsive to Change of Mailing Address filed on March 14, 2001.

2.   Claims 1-26 have been considered. Claims 1, 13, and 22 are independent claims.

Priority

3.   Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers

have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

4.   ' The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly

indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Method for Importing Data from XML Files".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-9, 11-20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Lee et al. ("Lee"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0169788 A1.

Independent Claims 1, 13, 22 and Claims 2, 3, 4, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25

Lee discloses a method, computer system, and computer program for importing data from

XML files (see Abstract), comprising the steps of:

specifying an XML file to be imported; *uploading the specified XML file* (pg. 6, §§[0095]-

0099]);

parsing the XML file to provide programmatic access to a structure and content of data

being imported; for instance into a series of values for graphically representing the structure of

the data, such as nodes of an information Document Object Model (DOM) tree (pg. 16, § [0222];

pg. 21, §§ [0266]-[0273]; see also Fig. 14 → The XML files are parsed into a document object

model (DOM)-compliant graphical XML tree structure composed of nodes and edges. Each

node of the tree and their attribute values corresponds to one element in the XML document);

and *storing corresponding metadata and data values in tables* (pg. 6, §§ [0084]-[0089] *et*

seq.; see also Figs. 1 and 1A → data values are stored in the "metadata tables").

Claims 5 and 17

Lee discloses a method and system for importing data, further including displaying the

information tree (see Fig. 14).

Claims 6 and 18

Lee discloses a method and computer system for importing data, further including

inspecting the information tree, correcting the values, into a format suitable to pass to the

information tree (pg. 16, § [0222]; pg. 21, §§ [0266]-[0273]; see also Fig. 14→ the parser supports all the necessary functions to traverse the node tree, access the nodes and their attribute values, insert and delete nodes, to ensure proper formatting).

Claims 7, 19, 26

Lee discloses a method, system, and program for importing data, wherein *all tags that appear at a same tree level become fields on a form of the same type* (pg. 21, §§ [0267]-[0274] → tags are visited on a level-by-level basis; each child node become fields on a form of the same type).

Claims 8, 20

Lee discloses a method and system for importing data according to claim 1, wherein once an *XML document has been received from an external source, the XML document is fed into a data driven application* (see Title and Abstract → i.e. relational schema database).

Claim 9

Lee discloses a method for importing data according to claim 8, wherein a conversion to a data driven application includes the steps:

creating new metadata which define respective forms; and starting with a root node, and any node with only a single child becomes a new field on a current form, and any node with more than one child requires a new child form (pg. 21, §§ [0267]-[0274]; see also Figs. 12 and 13 → starting with a root node, any node with only one child becomes a new field and a new tuple is created for any node with more than one child).

Claims 11 and 12

Lee discloses a method for importing data further including *populating each form with content from the imported XML files using the new metadata starting with the root node, and populating each field in the form with data from a corresponding location in the imported XML file* (pg. 7, § [0101]; pg. 21, §§ [0267]-[0274]; see also Figs. 1A, 12 and 13 → the pattern and pattern mapping tables are fed to the loader to create and fill the tables and the relational database according to the generated table schema therein).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. ("Lee"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0169788 A1, in view of Flight et al. ("Flight"), U.S. Patent No. 6,662,199.

Claims 10 and 21

Lee teaches a method for importing data with respect to claim 9 above, but does not specifically teach associating workflows with the forms.

However, Flight teaches a method and apparatus for customized hosted applications for creating workflows, visual representations of workflows, and/or data forms (see Abstract) for the purpose of defining series of tasks within an organization to produce a final outcome.

Since Lee and Flight are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Flight would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Lee. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Lee with the teachings of Flight to include associating workflows with database forms for the purpose of defining series of tasks within an organization to produce a final outcome.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 20020123993 A1	US-PGPUB	20020905	Chau, Hoang K. et al.
US 6721727 B2	USPAT	20040413	Chau, Hoang K. et al.
US 6209124 B1	USPAT	20010327	Vermeire, Dean R. et al.
US 20030069908 A1	US-PGPUB	20030410	Anthony, Jon S et al.
US 6418446 B1	USPAT	20020709	Lection, David Bruce et al.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (703) 305-8776. The examiner can normally be reached from 10 am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER